	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/966,105	DEEMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1732
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u>		
(1) Mathieu D. Vargot.	(3)	
(2) Mr. Seidleck.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 23 June 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: Claim 10		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Claim 10 was dependent on cancelled claim 2—the dependency has been corrected to be from claim 1.		
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	e examiner will provide a wri record of the substance of th	tten summary of the substance ne interview, since the interview
	-	
Months of Verson		
Mother Kingst (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicar	nt/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)